UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/153,781 | 09/16/1998 | LOUIS B. ROSENBERG | IMM053 | 6020 |

34300 7590 12/10/2007

PATENT DEPARTMENT (51851)
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 WEST FOURTH STREET
WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27101

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LIANG, REGINA | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2629 | |
| **MAIL DATE** | **DELIVERY MODE** |
| 12/10/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/153,781 | ROSENBERG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Regina Liang | 2629 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *12-15, 17-23, 25, 36-40, 42, 43, 58-70, 72-76, 78-82, 92-96, 98-111, 113-116, 120-147* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 12-15,17-23,25,36-40,42,43,58-70,72-76,78-82,92-96,98-111,113-116 and 120-147.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/30/07 has been entered. Claims 12-15, 17-23, 25, 36-40, 42, 43, 58-70, 72-76, 78-82, 92-96, 98-111, 113-116, 120-147 are pending.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### *Double Patenting*

3. Claims 122-147 of this application conflict with claims 44-69 of Application No. 10/615,927. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. Claims 122-147 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 44-69 of copending Application No. 10/615927. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. Claims 12, 13, 17-21, 36-40, 75, 102-104, 106, 109-111, 113, 120-127, 130, 143-146 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pierce et al. (5,299,810).

With regard to claim 12, Pierce et al. teaches a system (figures 1, 2) comprising: a network means (items 77 and 78); a first computer coupled to said network means (item 74), said first computer comprising a first visual display (item 42) and a first human/computer interface device capable of providing a first computer input ("first interface device" including items 62, 66, 90 and 12), said first interface device comprising an actuator capable of providing tactile sensations in response to a haptic feedback signal provided by said first computer (item 26 and column 1, lines 50-55), said first computer developing a first image in a first gaming environment on said visual display that is associated with first stored tactile sensation information (figure 1, item 114), wherein said first computer produces said first image and said haptic feedback signal based at least in part on information received from a second computer (figure 2, item 76) and based at least in part on said first computer input (column 1, lines 57-69 and column 2, lines 1-10; col. 5, lines 17-45; col. 9, lines 32-60), and said second computer

coupled to said network and comprising a second visual display (figure 2, item 44) configured to produce a graphical environment, and a second interface device capable of providing a second computer input (figure 2, "second human/computer interface device" including items 68, 72, 92 and 14), said second interface device comprising an actuator capable of providing haptic feedback in response to a haptic feedback signal provided by said second computer (figure 2, item 28), said second computer developing a second image in a second gaming environment on said second visual display substantially simultaneously with said development of said first image in said first gaming environment (figure 1, item 110), said second image associated with second stored tactile sensation information (figure 2, item 28), wherein said second computer produces said second image and said haptic feedback signal based on information received from said first computer and based on said second computer input (column 1, lines 57-69 and column 2, lines 1-10; col. 5, lines 17-45; col. 9, lines 32-60).

With regard to claim 13, Pierce et al. teaches a system as recited in claim 12 wherein said second computer means input comprises at least one of a position input for said human/computer interface device, and a button click input (figure 2, item 90).

With regard to method claim 17, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of apparatus claim 12 to have an apparatus that makes the method of claim 17 anticipated. In addition Pierce et al. teaches "wherein said first computer information comprises information representing a position of a manipulandum, generating a graphic environment" (figure 1, items 50 and 60) ; And further the communication links between the items 76, 77 correspond to "a network interface of a second computer" as claimed.

With regard to claim 18, Pierce et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 17 wherein said first computer information includes haptic feedback information indicating a tactile sensation to be output by said second haptic feedback device (figure 1, item 58 and figure 2 item 26).

With regard to claim 19, Pierce et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 17 further comprising sending second computer information from said second computer to said first computer over said network (figure 2, items 77 and 78).

With regard to claim 20, Pierce et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 19 wherein said second computer information includes said input information from said second haptic feedback device and haptic feedback information indicating a tactile sensation to be output by said first haptic feedback device (figure 1, item 58 and figure 2 item 26).

With regard to claim 21, Pierce et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 17 wherein said image includes displaying a first graphical object controlled by a user of said first haptic feedback device, and displaying a second graphical object controlled by a user of said second haptic feedback device (figure 1).

With regard to method claim 38, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of apparatus claim 12 and method claim 17 to have an apparatus and method that makes the method of claim 38 anticipated. In addition Pierce et al. teaches wherein said second computer information comprises position information describing a position of a manipulandum of a second haptic feedback device (figure 1, items 68 and 60). And further the communication links between the items 74 and 77 correspond to "a first network interface of said first computer" and

the communication links between the items 76 and 77 correspond to "a second network interface of said second computer" as claimed.

With regard to claims 36, 37, 39, and 40, Pierce et al. was shown above read on all limitation of these claims.

With regard to method claim 75, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of apparatus claim 12 and method claims 17 and 38 to have an apparatus and method that makes the method of claim 75 anticipated. In addition Pierce et al. teaches "said information comprising haptic feedback information and position information for a graphical object displayed by said second computer" (figure 1 illustrates graphical objects on two displays and items 110 and 114 correlate to haptic feedback).

With regard to method claim 102, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of apparatus claim 12 and method claims 17 and 38 to have an apparatus and method that makes claim 102 anticipated. In addition, Pierce et al. teaches "a first memory coupled to said first processor" and "a second memory coupled to said second processor" (col. 5, lines 64-66, col. 6, lines 14-16).

With regard to method claim 103, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of apparatus claim 12 and method claims 17 and 38 to have an apparatus and method that makes claim 103 anticipated.

With regard to claims 104, 106, Pierce et al. teaches "said first force feedback device is coupled to a manipulandum configured to move in two degrees of freedom" (figure 2, item 62 "Steering Handle" act as joystick for control of graphical "vehicle").

With regard to claim 109, Pierce et al. teaches the first image includes a graphical object that can interact with a projectile (e.g., col. 11, lines 3-17).

With regard to claims 110, 111, Pierce et al. was shown above read on all limitation as claimed (e.g., col. 11, lines 3-66).

With regard to claim 113, Pierce et al. teaches a visual display (42) coupled to the first processor.

With regard to claims 120, 121, Pierce teaches the processor as claimed.

With regard to claim 122, Figs. 1 and 2 of Pierce discloses an apparatus, comprising: a network interface (77, 78); a peripheral interface (62, 66, 68, 72, 90, 92); and a processor coupled (42, 44, 74, 76) to the network interface and the peripheral interface, the processor being associated with a first simulation of a virtual environment (space 48) including a first virtual object (58), the processor configured to receive from the network interface a signal associated with a second virtual object (60) within the virtual environment, the processor configured to send to the peripheral interface a signal associated with a haptic feedback based on a virtual interaction between the first virtual object and the second virtual object (col. 1, line 57 to col. 2, line 10; col. 5, lines 17-45; col. 9, lines 32 to 60 for example).

With regard to claim 123, Pierce discloses the processor is configured to receive from the peripheral interface a signal associated with a position of a manipulandum ("the computer 74 is electrically connected to the position sensors that are associated with the steering handle 62 and accelerator pedal 66. These sensors generate electrical control signals that are representative of the positions of the steering handle 62 and accelerator pedal 66. the electrical control signals are in turn conducted to the computer 74"), the processor is configured to send to the network

interface a signal associated with the first virtual object based on the position of the manipulandum (col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 30).

With regard to claim 124, Pierce discloses the processor being a first processor (42, 74), wherein the signal associated with the haptic feedback is configured to compensate within the first simulation for a delay between signals associated with the first virtual object and the signal associated with the second virtual object (col. 6, lines 31-56).

With regard to claim 125, Pierce discloses the processor being a first processor (42, 74), wherein: the virtual environment is defined by the first processor and a second processor (44, 76) in communication with the first processor over a network (77, 78), the first processor defining the first simulation of the virtual environment (48, 52), the second processor defining a second simulation of the virtual environment (48, 50), the first simulation substantially corresponding to the second simulation (col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 56).

With regard to claim 126, Pierce discloses the processor being a first processor, the signal associated with the haptic feedback being a first signal, the apparatus further comprising: a manipulandum (the position sensor s of 62, 66, 68, 72, 90, 92); an actuator (80-83) coupled to the manipulandum; and a second processor coupled to the actuator and the peripheral interface, the second processor configured to receive the first signal from the peripheral interface, the second processor configured to send a second signal to the actuator based on the first signal, the actuator configured to provide haptic feedback based on the second signal (col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 39 for example).

With regard to claim 127, Pierce discloses the processor being a first processor, the apparatus further comprising: a manipulandum having at least one degree of freedom (inherent

the position sensor of the steering handle 62 having at least one degree of freedom); an actuator (80-83) coupled to the manipulandum; a sensor configured to detect a position of the manipulandum in the at least one degree of freedom; and a second processor (44, 76) coupled to the sensor and the peripheral interface (68, 72), the second processor configured to send a position signal to the peripheral interface based on the position of the manipulandum, the first processor configured to send to the network interface a signal associated with the first virtual object based on the position signal (col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 30 for example).

With regard to claim 130, Pierce discloses the signal associated with the haptic feedback includes a positional offset (image 114), the positional offset being associated with a difference between the first virtual object and the second virtual object within the first simulation (col. 9, lines 46-60 for example).

With regard to claim 143, Pierce discloses the method, comprising: enabling a first simulation of a virtual environment on a first processor (Fig. 2, 42, 74) and a second simulation of the virtual environment on a second processor (42, 76), the first processor being in communication with a haptic feedback device (26), the second processor being in communication with a haptic feedback device (28); enabling the first processor to provide a signal to its haptic feedback device based on an interaction between a first virtual object and a second virtual object within the first simulation, the interaction within the first simulation being based on a position signal from the haptic feedback device of the first processor and a signal associated with the second virtual object from the second processor; and enabling the second processor to provide a signal to its haptic feedback device based on an interaction between the first virtual object and the second virtual object within the second simulation, the interaction

within the second simulation being based on a position signal from the haptic feedback device of the second processor and a signal associated with the first virtual object from the first processor (col. 1, line 57 to col. 2, line 10; col. 5, lines 17-45; col. 9, lines 32 to 60 for example).

With regard to claim 144, Pierce disclose comprising: enabling synchronization between the first simulation and the second simulation based, at least in part, on the signal to the haptic feedback device of the first processor and the signal to the haptic feedback device of the second processor (col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 39 for example).

With regard to claim 145, Pierce discloses the first processor is a first video-gaming console (12, 42, 62, 66, 74, 90), the haptic feedback device (26) associated with the first processor is a first controller; and the second processor is a second video-gaming console (14, 44, 68, 72, 76, 92), the haptic feedback device (28) associated with the second processor is a second controller.

With regard to claim 146, Pierce discloses the first controller includes a manipulandum (62, 66, 90), the position signal from the first controller being based on a position of the manipulandum of first controller; and the second controller includes a manipulandum (68, 72, 92), the position signal from the second controller being based on a position of the manipulandum of first controller.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce et al. (US. 5,299,810).

With regard to claim 22 Pierce et al. does not illustrate a method as recited in claim 21 wherein said first and second graphical objects are paddles. He instead illustrates them being vehicles such as a car however since a boat is also a vehicle and further since boats can have paddles such a feature would be obvious and simply viewed as merely directed toward an obvious intended use of the Pierce et al. gaming system.

8. Claims 23, 42, 43, 58-70, 72-74, 76, 78-82, 108, 114-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce et al. in view of Yamakita et al.

With regard to claim 58, Pierce et al. was shown above to cover most of the limitations. However Pierce et al. does not illustrate "a server computer over a network" Pierce et al. instead use a local "common ram board" to create a network means for his two computers.

Yamakita et al. illustrates in figure 1 two Sites 1 & 2 remote to each other transmitting and receiving (a network interface) haptic information to and from a satellite above where it is clear that the satellite functions as a server computer between the two computers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Pierce et al. apparatus to use a server computer on a network as taught by Yamakita because the feature of being able to play the game with other players at any location such as Japan and USA would clearly be desirable and therefore motivational to all users.

With regard to claim 23, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. suggest a method as recited in claim 21 wherein said first and second graphical objects are displayed in a web page

is viewed as an obvious feature of a network because the window opened up is considered the web page when talking to a remote user.

With regard to claims 42-43 limitations were shown above by the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al.

With regard to claims 59-70, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. was shown above to read on all these limitations.

With regard to claims 72, 73, 115, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. suggest a method as recited in claim 75 wherein said first computer is a client computer and said second computer is a server computer because it is obvious that when you are playing the computer instead of another actual user you would refer to one computer as sever and the other client.

With regards to claims 74 and 76, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. was shown above to teach all of these limitations.

With regard to claim 78, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. teaches method as recited in claim 75 wherein said visual display is updated by moving a graphical object within a graphical game environment based on position data received from said haptic feedback device, where a collision between said graphical object and a different graphical object can detected to cause said tactile sensation to be output (see Pierce et al figure 1, item 114).

With regard to claim 79, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 75 wherein said first computer receives an indication of a gaming event in said information, said first computer synchronizing said visual display associated with said gaming event with said tactile sensation that is associated with said gaming event (see Pierce et al. figure 1, item 114 and 110).

With regard to claim 80-81, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 79 wherein said gaming event is a collision, explosion (see Pierce et al. figure 1, item 114 and 110).

With regard to claim 82, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. teaches a method as recited in claim 79 wherein said visual display is updated at a rate substantially faster than said tactile sensation (see Yamakita et al. abstract).

With regards to claim 108, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. was shown above to teach all of these limitations where the first computer and the second computer communicate with at least one server computer over said network.

With regards to claim 114, the combination of Pierce and Yamakita et al. was shown above to teach all of these limitations where a server computer connected to the network.

With regard to claim 116, the combination of Pierce et al. and Yamakita et al. do not illustrate the use of well known standards of practice such as TCP/IP protocols and since the references lacks specific communication details it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to implement these features because the combination of Pierce et al. must use some communication method and one would be motivated to use conventional methods of communication because there is less risk in using standards that are known to work. The examiner also serves official Notice that TCP/IP existed before applicant's effective filing date.

9. Claim 128 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce in view of Thacher et al (US. 5,917,725).

With regard to claim 128, Pierce differs from the claim in that the network interface is not at least one of an Ethernet connection and a modem connection. However, Thacher is cited to teach using one least one of an Ethernet connection and a modem connection as a network interface for providing communication between a plurality of game devices (col. 5, lines 58-57, col. 11, lines 60-65 for example). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the network interface of Pierce to be at least one of Ethernet connection and a modem connection as taught by Thacher so as to provide large scale game playing with very diverse player locations (col. 1, lines 52-53 of Thacher).

10. Claims 14-15, 25, 105, 107, 129, 131-142, 147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce et al. (5,299,810) in view of Ouhyoung et al. ("A low-Cost Force Feedback Joystick and its use in PC Video Games", IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics, Vol 41. No. 3, AUGUST 1995 pages 787-794) and Kelley et al. ("MagicMouse: Tactile and Kinesthetic Feedback in the Human-Computer Interface using an Electromagnetically Actuated Input/Output Device).

With regard to claim 14, Pierce et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of claims 12.

Pierce et al. does not illustrate the use of, "a local controller means that communicates with said second computer means",

Ouhyoung et al. teaches a local controller with the above claim features in figure 3b and note also used in a PC Video Game.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Pierce et al. device to have the above features as taught by Ouhyoung because Kelley et al on page 9 makes a motivational statement, "a dedicated microcontroller is employed to distribute the computational load and to afford adequate force feedback".

With regard to claim 15, the combination Pierce et al. /Ouhyoung et al./Kelley teaches a system as recited in claim 14 wherein said second computer means sends a force feedback command to said local controller means that can be parsed by said local controller means such that said controller means can control said actuator means in response to said force feedback command in a control loop with said sensor means (see Ouhyoung figures 3b and 4).

With regard to claim 25, the combination Pierce et al. /Ouhyoung et al./Kelley a method as recited in claim 17 wherein said second haptic feedback device includes a local controller that communicates with said second computer, wherein said local controller parses a haptic feedback command sent by said second computer such that said local haptic can control said actuator in response to said haptic feedback command in a control loop with at least one sensor of said second haptic feedback device (see Ouhyoung figures 3b and 4).

With regard to claim 105, the combination Pierce et al. /Ouhyoung et al./Kelley teaches a system as recited in claim 104. in addition Pierce teaches "at least one sensor for sensing positions of said manipulatable object " (It is clear that a steering wheel such as item 62 must have a sensor detecting its position in order for it to work and control the graphical object).

With regard to claim 107, the combination Pierce et al. /Ouhyoung et al./Kelley was found above to teach all of the limitations of claim 107.

With regard to claims 129, Ouhyoung et al. teaches a local controller with the above claim features in figure 3b.

With regard to claims 131-136, 137-142, Pierce teaches the apparatus having a first and a second processors, Ouhyoung teaches a local controller (local processor), thus, the combination Pierce et al. /Ouhyoung et al./Kelley teach all of the limitations as claimed.

With regard to claim 147, Pierce teaches the video-gaming console, and Ouhyoung teaches a local processor coupled to the actuator.

11. Claims 92-96, 98-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Pierce et al. and Yamakita et al. as applied to claim 58 above, and further in view of Ouhyoung et al. and Kelley et al.

With regard to method claim 101, the combination of Pierce et al. and Yamakita et al. was shown above in regard to the rejection of claim 58. In addition the combination of Pierce et al. and Yamakita et al. teaches "each of said plurality of client computers in communication with the Internet" (see Yamakita figure 1 where claim term "internet" is broadly read to be any network), enabling said computer-game simulation of said particular client computer to determine if said first graphical object displayed on said client computer has collided with said second graphical object and determine a tactile sensation to generate if said collision has occurred (see Pierce et al. figures 3 and 4).

The combination of Pierce et al. and Yamakita et al. does not illustrate, "wherein said haptic feedback device comprises a user manipulatable object, a movement of said user manipulatable object tracked by a sensor of said haptic feedback device, and wherein said local

model receives position data from said haptic feedback device describing said movement and sends haptic feedback data to said haptic feedback device".

Ouhyoung et al. teaches a local controller with the above claim features in figure 3b and note also used in a PC Video Game.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Pierce et al. steering wheel to have the above features as taught by Ouhyoung because Kelley et al on page 9 makes a motivational statement, "a dedicated microcontroller is employed to distribute the computational load and to afford adequate force feedback".

With regard to claims 94-96, 98-100 the combination of Pierce et al. /Yamakita/Ouhyoung et al./Kelley was shown above to read on all of these limitations.

With regard to claim 92, see e.g. Pierce col. 8 lines 16-35 which discloses determining if a shot was fired, and inherently a button input is present in order to determine this shot.

With regard to claim 93, the combination of Pierce et al. /Yamakita/Ouhyoung et al./Kelley suggest a method as recited in claim 101 wherein said first graphical object is a representation of sporting equipment because Pierce et al. illustrates a car game and since race cars are the equipment used by race car drivers it reads on it.

### *Response to Arguments*

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-15, 17-23, 25, 36-40, 42, 43, 58-70, 72-76, 78-82, 92-96, 98-111, 113-116, 120-147 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument on pages 18-19 that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. specifics of a network) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The memory is board enough to meet the broad claims. Reading information from RAM reads on "receiving ... information over a network" as claimed.

In response to applicant's argument on page 21-22 that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Yamakita teaches to allow people to play the game with other players at any distant location, e.g. see abstract, page 1103 left hand column third paragraph. Therefore, a suggestion to combine the references was set forth in the rejection.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Regina Liang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Regina Liang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2674

12/6/07